IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R.BASANT

WEDNESDAY, THE 19TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 28TH BHADRA 1929

Bail Appl..No. 5649 of 2007()

CRIME NO. 487/02 OF KUNDARA POLICE STATION
CC.812/2006 of J.M.F.C.-I, KOLLAM

.....

PETITIONER/ACCUSED

SREEJITH, S/O.SIVASANKARAN NAIR,
ARAYKKAL KIZHAKKATHIL, ASRAMAM,
KOLLAM VILLAGE, KOLLAM.

BY ADV. SRI.VINOY VARGHESE KALLUMOOTTILL

RESPONDENTS: COMPLAINANT/STATE

---

1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.

2. SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KUNDARA POLICE STATION,
KUNDARA.

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI. JAI GEORGE

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 19/09/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

R. BASANT, J.

- -

B.A.No. 5649 of 2007

- -

Dated this the 19th day of September, 2007

O R D E R

The petitioner faces indictment in a prosecution for offences punishable, inter alia, under Section 427 r/w. 34 I.P.C. All offences are bailable. The co-accused have already been tried, found not guilty and acquitted. The petitioner was not available for trial. Consequently the case against him has been split up. Coercive processes have been issued by the learned Magistrate. The petitioner finds a warrant of arrest chasing him.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is absolutely innocent. His absence was not wilful, but was due to reasons beyond his control. The petitioner is willing to appear before the learned Magistrate, but he apprehends that his application for bail may not be considered by the learned Magistrate on merits, in accordance with law and expeditiously. He therefore prays that directions under Section 438 and/or 482 Cr.P.C. may be issued in favour of the petitioner.

3. The learned Prosecutor opposes the application. He submits that the petitioner may be directed to appear before the Investigator or the learned Magistrate and then seek regular bail in the normal course.

4. I find merit in the opposition by the learned Prosecutor. It is trite after the decision in **Bharat Chaudhary** v. **State of Bihar** (AIR 2003 SC 4662) that powers under Section 438 Cr.P.C. can be invoked even in favour of a petitioner, who apprehends arrest in the pending case on the strength of a non-bailable warrant issued by the court. Even that is not by itself sufficient to justify the invocation of the jurisdiction under Section 438 Cr.P.C. I am unable to find any compelling reasons which would justify invocation of the jurisdiction under Section 438 Cr.P.C.

5. It is certainly for the petitioner to appear before the learned Magistrate and explain to the learned Magistrate the circumstances under which he could not earlier appear before the learned Magistrate. I have no reason to assume that the learned Magistrate would not consider the application for bail to be filed by the petitioner when he surrenders before the learned Magistrate, on merits, in accordance with law and expeditiously. Every court must do the same. No special or specific direction appears to be necessary. Sufficient general directions have

already been issued by this Court in the decision in **Alice George** v. **Dy.S.P. of Police** (2003 (1) KLT 339).

6. This application is accordingly dismissed. I may however hasten to observe that if the petitioner appears before the learned Magistrate and applies for bail after giving sufficient prior notice to the Prosecutor in charge of the case, the learned Magistrate must proceed to pass orders on merits, in accordance with law and expeditiously - on the date of surrender itself.

(R. BASANT)
Judge

tm